IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION

LONNIE EDWARD ASHLEY,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	No. 3:20-cv-1963-N-BN
	§	
HILLCREST HOUSE, ASD, and DOD,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Plaintiff Lonnie Edward Ashley has filed a *pro se* action that has been referred to the undersigned United States magistrate judge for pretrial management under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and a standing order of reference from United States District Judge David C. Godbey. Through a separate order, the Court has granted Ashley leave to *proceed in forma pauperis* ("IFP"). The undersigned now enters these findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation that the Court should dismiss this action with prejudice, denying any pending motions filed by Ashley.

Legal Standards

A district court is required to screen a civil action filed IFP and may summarily dismiss that action, or any portion of the action, if, for example, it fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). "The language of § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) tracks the language of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)." *Black v. Warren*, 134 F.3d 732, 733-34 (5th Cir. 1998) (per curiam).

And "[i]t is well-established that a district court may dismiss a complaint on

its own motion under [Rule] 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief may granted." *Starrett v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, No. 3:18-cv-2851-M-BH, 2018 WL 6069969, at *1 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 30, 2018) (citing *Carroll v. Fort James Corp.*, 470 F.3d 1171 (5th Cir. 2006) (citing, in turn, *Shawnee Int'l, N.V. v. Hondo Drilling Co.*, 742 F.2d 234, 236 (5th Cir. 1984))), *rec. accepted*, 2018 WL 6068991 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 20, 2018), *aff'd*, 763 F. App'x 383 (5th Cir.) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, 140 S. Ct. 142 (2019).

A district court may exercise its "inherent authority ... to dismiss a complaint on its own motion ... 'as long as the procedure employed is fair.'" *Gaffney v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*, 294 F. App'x 975, 977 (5th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (quoting *Carroll*, 470 F.3d at 1177 (quoting, in turn, *Bazrowx v. Scott*, 136 F.3d 1053, 1054 (5th Cir. 1998)); citation omitted). The United States Court of Appeals for Fifth Circuit has "suggested that fairness in this context requires both notice of the court's intention to dismiss *sua sponte* and an opportunity to respond." *Id.* (quoting *Lozano v. Ocwen Fed. Bank, FSB*, 489 F.3d 636, 643 (5th Cir. 2007) (quoting, in turn, *Carroll*, 470 F.3d at 1177); internal quotation marks and brackets omitted). These findings, conclusions, and recommendations provides notice, and the period for filing objections to them affords an opportunity to respond. *See, e.g., Starrett*, 2018 WL 6069969, at *2 (citations omitted)).

Dismissal for failure to state a claim under either Rule 12(b)(6) or Section 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) "turns on the sufficiency of the '*factual* allegations' in the complaint," *Smith v. Bank of Am., N.A.*, 615 F. App'x 830, 833 (5th Cir. 2015) (per curiam) (quoting *Johnson v. City of Shelby, Miss.*, 574 U.S. 10, 12 (2014) (per curiam)), as

neither the IFP statute nor the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure "countenance dismissal of a complaint for imperfect statement of the legal theory supporting the claim asserted," *Johnson*, 574 U.S. at 11.

Instead, plaintiffs need only "plead facts sufficient to show" that the claims asserted have "substantive plausibility" by stating "simply, concisely, and directly events" that they contend entitle them to relief. *Id.* at 12 (citing FED. R. CIV. P. 8(a)(2)-(3), (d)(1), (e)).

"A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009). "The plausibility standard is not akin to a 'probability requirement,' but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully." *Id.* And "[a] claim for relief is implausible on its face when 'the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct.'" *Harold H. Huggins Realty, Inc. v. FNC, Inc.*, 634 F.3d 787, 796 (5th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679); *see also Inclusive Communities Project, Inc. v. Lincoln Prop. Co.*, 920 F.3d 890, 899 (5th Cir. 2019) ("'Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief' is 'a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.'" (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 679; citing *Robbins v. Oklahoma*, 519 F.3d 1242, 1248 (10th Cir. 2008) ("[T]he degree of specificity necessary to establish plausibility and fair notice, and therefore the need to include sufficient factual allegations, depends on context.")).

While, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff must allege more than labels and conclusions, and, while a court must accept all of a plaintiff's allegations as true, it is "not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). A threadbare or formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, will not suffice. *See id.*

This rationale has even more force here, as the Court "must construe the pleadings of *pro se* litigants liberally," *Andrade v. Gonzales*, 459 F.3d 538, 543 (5th Cir. 2006), "to prevent the loss of rights due to inartful expression," *Marshall v. Eadison*, 704CV123HL, 2005 WL 3132352, at *2 (M.D. Ga. Nov. 22, 2005) (citing *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980)).

But "liberal construction does not require that the Court ... create causes of action where there are none." *Smith v. CVS Caremark Corp.*, No. 3:12-cv-2465-B, 2013 WL 2291886, at *8 (N.D. Tex. May 23, 2013). "To demand otherwise would require the 'courts to explore exhaustively all potential claims of a *pro se* plaintiff, [and] would also transform the district court from its legitimate advisory role to the improper role of an advocate seeking out the strongest arguments and most successful strategies for a party.'" *Jones v. Mangrum*, No. 3:16-cv-3137, 2017 WL 712755, at *1 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 23, 2017) (quoting *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985)).

"Ordinarily, 'a *pro se* litigant should be offered an opportunity to amend his

complaint before it is dismissed.'" *Wiggins v. La. State Univ. – Health Care Servs. Div.*, 710 F. App'x 625, 627 (5th Cir. 2017) (per curiam) (quoting *Brewster v. Dretke*, 587 F.3d 764, 767-68 (5th Cir. 2009)). But leave to amend is not required where an amendment would be futile, *i.e.,* "an amended complaint would still 'fail to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion," *Stem v. Gomez*, 813 F.3d 205, 215-16 (5th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Marucci Sports, L.L.C. v. Nat'l Collegiate Athletic Ass'n*, 751 F.3d 368, 378 (5th Cir. 2014)), or where a plaintiff has already amended his claims, *see Nixon v. Abbott*, 589 F. App'x 279, 279 (5th Cir. 2015) (per curiam) ("Contrary to Nixon's argument, he was given the opportunity to amend his complaint in his responses to the magistrate judge's questionnaire, which has been recognized as an acceptable method for a *pro se* litigant to develop the factual basis for his complaint." (citation omitted)).

Analysis

A district court's authority to dismiss an action that "fails to 'state a claim for relief that is plausible on its face'" extends to dismissal of "claims that are 'clearly baseless,' including 'claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios.'" *Starrett*, 763 F. App'x at 383-84 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 570, then *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327-28 (1989); citing *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992) (concluding that dismissal "is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them")).

Ashley brings such claims before this Court. *See generally* Dkt. No. 3. And he has amended those incredible claims on a regular basis since filing this action. *See*

Dkt. Nos. 5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, & 13.

To illustrate the nature of Ashley's claims, he begins his complaint by asserting "[c]onspiracy against rights, under the color of law, 5yrs 5states" and next alleges "[p]laced at a monitored HIV+ (Hillcrest) complex, to assist in evasion of trying to murder a gay man over HIV. Conspirators beings authorized by military Intel, to violate and discriminate, but absolutely refuse to validate. Military blocks law, ignores and destroys evidence, while promoting perjury. *** Obstruction of Justice by Military (aka: #links-ignore) for Gov and Conspirators to evade, violate, and fabricate with read into tactics and fabricated psychosomatics with pharmaceuticals and CIA Torture." Dkt. No. 3 at 2.

In sum, after reviewing the conspiratorial allegations contained in Ashley's complaint, the undersigned finds that he has set out claims that are fantastic, delusional, irrational, or wholly incredible. The Court should therefore dismiss his claims with prejudice and deny his motions to appoint counsel [Dkt. No. 6], for judgment [Dkt. No. 7], and to amend [Dkt. No. 13]. *Cf. Starrett*, 763 F. App'x at 384 ("Starrett asks us to overturn the district court's dismissal based on outlandish claims of near-constant surveillance, theft of intellectual property, and painful remote communication accomplished using nonexistent technology. These pleaded facts are facially implausible. Dismissal with prejudice was appropriate, the district court did not err …."); *Simmons v. Payne*, 170 F. App'x 906, 907-08 (5th Cir. 2006) (per curiam) ("The district court found that Simmons's assertion of a vast conspiracy by all levels of the state government and federal government was manifestly frivolous because the

factual allegations were fanciful, irrational, incredible, and delusional. … Our review of Simmons's complaint convinces us that the dismissal as frivolous was not an abuse of discretion." (citations omitted)); *Kolocotronis v. Club of Rome*, 109 F.3d 767, 1997 WL 115260, at *1 (5th Cir. Feb. 24, 1997) (per curiam) ("The district court did not abuse its discretion in adopting a magistrate judge's finding that Kolocotronis' allegations, which describe a government plot to spread the AIDS virus throughout the world, were 'fantastic' and 'delusional' and therefore frivolous." (citation omitted)).

Recommendation

The Court should dismiss this action with prejudice, denying any pending motions filed by Plaintiff Lonnie Edward Ashley.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within 14 days after being served with a copy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b). In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or

adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. *See Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: August 12, 2020

DAVID L. HORAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE